

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920030850US1

PATENT

Section III: REMARKS

It is respectfully requested that the changes as noted above in Sections I and II be made to the present application.

The Abstract has been shortened to less than 15 lines and 150 words as required.

In the above referenced Office Action, which was mailed on 10/6/2006, claims 1, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko (U.S. Patent 7,024,626 B1, herein referred to as "Ko"), in view of Carroll (U.S. Patent 6,762,777, herein referred to as "Carroll"), claims 7-11 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko in view of Carroll and in still further view of Garland (U.S. Patent 6,252,596 herein referred to as "Garland"), claims 19-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko in view of Carroll and Garland and in still further view of Card et al (U.S. Patent 6,924,822 herein referred to as "Card"), and claims 2-6 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko in view of Carroll. Those rejections are respectfully traversed. However, in order to further the prosecution of the present application, and without waiving any of applicant's rights to argue the allowability of the originally presented claims in a subsequent appeal or other proceeding in the event that the Examiner does not concur that the present amendment places the application in condition for allowance, applicant has herein amended the claims to place them in condition for allowance.

It is noted that the present application includes claims 1-20

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920030650US1

PATENT

with claims 1, 16, 17 and 18 being independent claims, claims 2-15 being ultimately dependent from claim 1 and claims 19-20 being ultimately dependent from claim 18.

Independent claims 1, 16, 17 and 18 have herein been amended to clarify that in accordance with the present invention, a user is enabled **to change a location on the display device for the first position, which contains the extended information related to the first input field.** This "move enablement feature" to move the window of the extended text to a user-selected location relative to a first input field is disclosed on page 11, lines 18-25 of the application and Figures 4, 5 and 6, and also in the Summary of the Invention section, page 3, lines 5-13. The purpose of the move enablement feature is to enable the user to select where the user wishes to have the extended information window appear relative to a related input field. This feature is very helpful to a user when forms of differing format are presented for completion. Depending on the form layout, the user is enabled, for example, to select to locate the extended text window above the associated input field as shown, for example, at 311, or beside the associated input field as shown, for example, at 501, or in other locations relative to the input field. This feature of a user-movable information window is not taught, disclosed or even suggested by any of the cited references, and further, none of the references even recognizes the problem much less provides or even suggests a solution.

With particular regard to the rejection of independent claims 1, 16 and 17, the Ko reference teaches a system and method of producing user interface information messages but does not disclose or even suggest enabling a user to select and/or move the location of the information message relative to an information input field. Carroll discloses a system and method for associating pop-up windows with selected regions of a

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920030650US1

PATENT

document but Carroll is similar to Ko in that Carroll does not disclose or even suggest enabling a user to select and/or move the location of the information message relative to an information input field.

Therefore, even a combination of Ko and Carroll does not disclose or suggest the movable text feature. Thus since both Ko and Carroll do not disclose the user-enabled movable extended information window as claimed in independent claims 1, 16 and 17, it is believed that claims 1, 16 and 17 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over Ko and/or Carroll, or even the combination of Ko and Carroll.

With regard to the rejection of the last independent claim 18, it is noted that Garland discloses a system and method for command entry highlight editing, but is similar to Ko and Carroll in not disclosing or even suggesting the user-enabled movable extended information window as claimed in independent claim 18. Thus, since neither Ko, nor Carroll nor Garland discloses or suggests the user-enabled movable extended information window as claimed in independent claim 18, it is believed that claim 18 is allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over Ko in view of Carroll and even in still further view of Garland.

It is further noted that the applicant is not claiming the use of any of the individual elements of a claim standing alone, but rather the entire combination of elements and relationships among those elements as set out in the claims as herein amended. Applicant is aware the individual elements of any claim can be isolated, and, when standing alone, those elements can be found in existing references. The similarity of various pieces and parts of the references as noted on pages 2-10 of the above-identified Office Action have been noted but it is believed that there is no suggestion or nexus among the references to even

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920030850US1

PATENT

suggest any combination of those references or the total combination of elements and relationships as recited in the claims as herein amended. Where there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references for the specific total combination of elements and relationships among those elements, as claimed by an applicant, it is submitted to be inappropriate to search the prior art using applicant's own disclosure as a recipe, to find piecemeal elements in prior art references for individual claimed elements, and then to combine those references in a manner not disclosed or even suggested by any of the references in order to reject applicant's own claims.

In view of the current amendments made to the independent claims 1 and 16-18 of the present application, which clearly distinguish claims 1, 16, 17 and 18 from the cited Ko, Carroll and Garland references as discussed above, it is believed that independent claims 1, 16, 17 and 18 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over any combination of Ko, Carroll and/or Garland. Further, since all of the remaining claims 2-15 and 19-20 are dependent upon and include all of the limitations of one of the amended independent claims, in addition to the further specific details recited in the individual dependent claims, it is submitted that, for the reasons given above, dependent claims 2-15 and 19-20 are also allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over the cited references.

Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-20, as herein presented, are believed to be in condition for allowance, an early notice of which is hereby requested. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting the allowance of this application, and especially if one or more new references are cited, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below, prior to the issuance of another Office Action, in order to allow the applicant the opportunity to further amend the claims by

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
DEC 13 2006

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920030850US1

PATENT

Supplemental Amendment or Examiner's Amendment, as may be appropriate, to place the claims in condition for allowance. The Examiner's attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert V. Wilder/

Robert V. Wilder (Tel: 512-246-8555)
Registration No. 26,352
Attorney for Applicants
4235 Kingsburg Drive
Round Rock, Texas 78681